

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

As discussed with the Examiner by telephone on August 18, 2009, the amendment filed on July 14, 2009 placed the application in condition for allowance but had a minor non-compliance to format. The minor non-compliance to format was that the cancelling of claims 44-52 was instructed and discussed in the REMARKS/ARGUMENTS section, but such claims 44-52 were mistakenly left out of the AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS section. This document includes the correction to the minor non-compliance with claims 44-52 listed in the AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS section. As discussed, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow the application and correct the minor non-compliance to format by Examiner's Amendment.

The remainder of this document is the same as filed on July 14, 2009. Applicant acknowledges receipt of the Office Action dated January 16, 2009. By this Response, claims 44-52 are cancelled, and claims 53-67 are added. Claims 53-67 are now pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claims 44, 45, 47-49, 51, and 52 as being anticipated by Rosenberg et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,185,075 ("Rosenberg"). The Examiner rejected claims 46 and 50 as being unpatentable over Rosenberg. Applicant believes the pending claims are allowable over the art of record and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

**I. Claims 44, 45, 47-49, 51, and 52 have been cancelled.**

The Examiner rejected claims 44, 45, 47-49, 51, and 52 as being anticipated by Rosenberg. Please note that by this Response, claims 44, 45, 47-49, 51, and 52 are cancelled.

**II. Claims 46 and 50 have been cancelled.**

The Examiner rejected claims 46 and 50 as being unpatentable over Rosenberg. Please note that by this Response, claims 46 and 50 have been cancelled.

**III. New claims 53-67 are allowable.**

By this Response, Applicant has added claims 53-67. Claims 53, 58, and 63 are independent claims. Please note that claim 53 corresponds to previous claim 20 amended to include the limitations of previous claim 22, claim 58 corresponds to previous claim 26 amended to include the limitations of previous claim 28, and claim 63 corresponds to previous claim 32 amended to include the limitations of previous claim 34. In the Office Action dated July 28, 2008, the Examiner set forth that “[c]laims 22, 28, and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” (7/28/08 Office Action, pg. 5) Claims 53, 58, and 63 reflect the rewriting of claims 22, 28, and 34 in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 53, 58, and 63 have been placed in condition for allowance and therefore are allowable.

Claims 54-57 are dependent upon independent claim 53, claims 59-62 are dependent upon independent claim 58, and claims 64-67 are dependent upon independent claim 63. Such dependent claims 54-57, 59-62, and 64-67 correspond to the previous claims dependent upon previous claims 20, 26, and 32. Applicant respectfully submits that such claims 54-57, 59-62, and 64-67 are allowable because they depend upon allowable independent claims.

**IV. Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, allowance of the pending claims and a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be

Appl. No. 10/501,538  
Response to Office Action  
Dated January 16, 2009

considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art that have yet to be raised but which may be raised in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

/ttumey/  
Tod T. Tumey  
Tumey L.L.P.  
Reg. No. 47,146  
P. O. Box 22188  
Houston, Texas 77227-2188  
(713) 622-7005 (Phone)  
(713) 622-0220 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT